

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
SASQUA GROUP, INC. and CHRISTOPHER G.  
TORS,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

LORI COURTNEY and ARTEMIS CONSULTING,  
INC.,

Defendants.

-----X

**ORDER**  
09-cv-528(ADS)(ETB)

**APPEARANCES:**

**Arnold & Porter LLP**

*Attorneys for the plaintiffs*

399 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10022

By: Emily A. Kim, Esq.  
Richard P. Swanson, Esq., of Counsel

**Law Offices of Martin J. Murray, Esq.**

*Attorneys for the defendants*

475 Park Avenue South, 25th Floor

New York, NY 10016

By: Martin J. Murray, Esq.  
Nora von Stange, Esq., of Counsel

**SPATT, District Judge.**

The plaintiff commenced this case on February 5, 2010, seeking preliminary and permanent injunctive relief preventing the defendants (1) from using disclosing, or providing access to any of the plaintiff Sasqua Group Inc.'s confidential, proprietary, and/or trade secret information, and (2)

contacting or communicating with the plaintiffs' client contacts. United States District Judge Leonard D. Wexler thereafter heard argument on whether a temporary restraining order should issue granting this relief, and on February 9, 2010, he denied the plaintiffs' request. Judge Wexler then referred the matter to United States Magistrate Judge A. Kathleen Tomlinson for a hearing on a preliminary injunction. After conducting a hearing, Judge Tomlinson issued on August 2, 2010 a thorough Report recommending (1) that information contained in the plaintiff Sasqua's database should not be granted trade secret protection, and (2) that the Court deny any preliminary injunctive relief. The Report also indicated that the parties had fourteen days to object to it. More than fourteen days have now elapsed since Judge Tomlinson issued her Report, and no objections have been filed.

In reviewing a report and recommendation, a court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C). "To accept the report and recommendation of a magistrate, to which no timely objection has been made, a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record." Wilds v. United Parcel Serv., 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (citing Nelson v. Smith, 618 F. Supp. 1186, 1189 (S.D.N.Y. 1985)). The Court has reviewed the Report by Judge Tomlinson and finds it to be persuasive and without any legal or factual errors. There being no objection to Judge Tomlinson's Report, it is hereby

**ORDERED**, that the Report and Recommendation by U.S. Magistrate Judge Tomlinson, dated August 2, 2010, is adopted in its entirety, and the plaintiffs' request for a preliminary injunction is denied.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: Central Islip, New York  
September 7, 2009

/s/ Arthur D. Spatt  
ARTHUR D. SPATT  
United States District Judge